CONSTRUCTION OF NATIONAL IDENTITY: POWER IN ACCEPTANCE SPEECHES

Monika Gyuró

Abstract

The study aims at analyzing the links between identity, institutions and discourse. As a method, the author applies Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to demonstrate how a prominent figure of the American political life interacts in an exceptional social situation reflecting the macro level of social forces. Within CDA's language analysis, the study also detects power relations through the lexico-grammatical level of language use.

According to the functional theory of language (Halliday 1994), the paper investigates the acceptance speech of Barack Obama on the representational, positional and expressive levels of language use. On the one hand, the contribution intends to reveal that the metaphor, pronoun, and modality system may show the charismatic ways of power manifestation in political talk. On the other hand, the paper concludes that the linguistic means the speaker applies in the speech contribute to the construction of national identity.

Key words

identity, institutions, nation, discourse, Critical Discourse Analysis

1   Introduction

The mutual relationship between identity and discourse represents a prominent issue of social interaction and at the same time a fundamental theme of the interdisciplinary studies.

The paper builds upon three theories, namely Fairclough's and Wodak's Critical Discourse Analysis (1995, 2009), Halliday's functional linguistics (1994) and van Leeuwen's socio-semantic approach (2008). The latter two systems complement the former method towards a deeper analysis of social interaction. The political speech that makes up the corpus comes from Congressional Quarterly Transcriptions[1]. Considering the many angles from which the relationship between identity and discourse can be investigated, the study focuses on identity as a discourse product that can be analyzed from a pragmatic point of view. The speech appears as a strain of strategies used by the speaker to achieve the overall purpose: to unite the American people. Although the primary concept of CDA (Wodak 2009) draws on the demonstration of exclusion of certain social actors within discourse, the present study focuses on the linguistic means of inclusion. It is a strategy that enables the speaker to express sameness, unity and solidarity

with the nation. In this way, national identity is being formed within the speech by the intention of the speaker.

The aim of the paper is twofold. Firstly, it intends to provide an analysis of the linguistic means, such as inclusion-exclusion, and to show the charismatic features of political power represented by the speaker.

Secondly, the study investigates those ways that contribute to the determination of national identity by the involvement of a broad spectrum of social actors. Thirdly, it also examines the particular use of pronouns and modality system in the speech. The corpus used for the present study consists of 13 pages with 4,867 word counts.

The study starts with the general definition of identity, its relation to discourse, and the particular features of institutional-national identity that play an important role in the analysis.

2 The concept of identity

The concept of identity has been an essential tenet for philosophers, psychologists and sociologist for centuries. Most commonly, it can be regarded as a person's apprehension of one's individuality or group relation such as national identity (Leary & Tangney 2003).

The formulation of identity as a social location takes back to Hegel (1807), who considered identity as an intersubjective matter. Several scholarly approaches follow this collective identity theory. Among them, the Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner 1986) describes the way in which individuals defines themselves in terms of the phenomena of "ingroups" and "outgroups". According to this view, identity is formed through the difference between "ingroup" (where the individual belongs) and "outgroup" (which is different from the former group). The concept of identity is considered as a complex and controversial phenomenon in the field of social sciences. On the one hand, scholars refer to identity as a context-bound and fluid characteristic of personality, on the other hand, as a homogeneous personality trait. The former approach claims that a person owns not only one, but rather many selves that correlate with different group memberships. An individual may have multiple social identities evoked by various social contexts. Thus, social identity can be understood as the individual's self-concept coming from perceived membership of particular social groups (Jones & McEwen 2007).

The dynamic process element of identity is a central factor in significant philosophical approaches to identity. By the end of the twentieth century, Derrida defined identity as a product of discourse (Derrida 1976). As a consequence, discourse-based approaches describe identity as a dynamic process, capable of establishing the discursive order.

In opposition to the framework of multiple identity concept, Weinrich and Saunderson (2003) state that identity is a homogeneous matter. They define it as "a structural representation of the individual's existential experience in which the relationships between self and other agents is organised in relatively stable structures over time with the emphasis on the socio-cultural milieu in which self relates to other agents and institutions" (ibid.: 65).

3 Institutional identities

The concept of institutions such as schools, hospitals, and administrative organizations is commonly associated with power that embodies the interests of the authorities of the organizations (Agar 1985).

According to Max Weber (in Lemert 2004), power is the ability to control other people or events. In Weber's definition, power may occur in authoritative, coercive and charismatic forms. Power is realized in the discourse processes of the participants in interaction (Foucault 1969).

Discourse in the broadest sense refers to any practice by which individuals assign meaning to reality. From the sociological point of view, discourse means communication about people, social organizations and the relationships among these three entities. Discourse emerges out of social institutions and relations of power structuring people's thoughts language and relationships. The power of discourse provides legitimacy for a sort of knowledge, but undermining others (Foucault 1969). Thus, power politics as a type of institutional discourse is in close relationship with persuasion, influence and behavior change. Parsons (1963) states that power politics is the ability of a political speaker to attain a behavior change of other political participants persuading them to act in a desired way.

The institutional framework of identity and power has shown stable characteristic forms such as ability to control others, goal achievement and coordination of human activity. However, Grant and Iedema (2005) challenge the traditional view of power by formulating it as a process. Presuming that power is a process, then it may be analyzed through interactions.

Investigating the issue from a different angle, we can discuss an intrinsic approach to understanding the links between institutions, discourse, and identity. Critical Discourse Analytic (CDA) accounts argue that the way people interact in social situations reflects existing macro-social and micro-discursive features. Institutional-political identity is, therefore, a function of these existing relations (Mäkitalo & Saljö 2000).

Despite the rather homogeneous nature of institutional identity, the present study shows that self in the political scene appears as a process that can be investigated as a moment-by-moment entity. The study intends to show that

the charismatic views of power reveal the cooperative feature of institutional discourse and the relationship between the social (macro) and discursive (micro) structures of life.

4   The construction of national identity in discourse

The concept of a nation is difficult to formulate. Anderson characterizes nations as imagined communities. They are characterized "not by their authenticity but by the way in which they are imagined" (Anderson 1983, in Wodak & De Cillia 2009: 21).

According to this concept, a nation is a mental construct containing the defining and steady elements of collective unity, equality, and autonomy, which identify the people with it emotionally. This imaginary community is accepted by those who feel to be the members of it. People realize the national community in only one way: it is constructed and conveyed in discourse, mainly in narratives of national culture. Therefore, national identity is a product of discourse.

Hall's argument emphasizes the discursive feature of the phenomenon and strengthens this conclusion. Hall claims that national identities lie in the memories of the culture that connect the present and past (Hall 1996).

Consequently, national identities seem to arise in the discourse of history and culture linking the present, past, and future. Thus, the personal dimension of national identity has appeared on the one hand in relation to the themes of history and culture. On the other hand, it has been related to selfhood, sameness, or difference (Ricoeur 1992). The relatively steady elements in national identity, such as collective historical memories, language and politics (Hall 1996), are in opposition to the personal features, such as uniqueness and autonomy. Moreover, nations can be conceived as hybrids of identity. Within a nation, there are conflicting ethnic, cultural and regional identities (Wodak & De Cillia 2009). Thus, the idea of multiple identities is opposed to the concept of homogeneous identity in the national framework. To conclude, national identity emerges at the borderline of homogeneity and heterogeneity.

5   The method: Linguistic methods in Critical Discourse Analysis

The study adopts Critical Discourse Analysis as a method for investigation as it focuses on the particular features of identity in discourse. The principal objective of CDA is to reveal structures of power, as well as the strategies of inclusion and exclusion in the language use. CDA begins with the premise that language is a form of ideological practice that constructs people's identities.

Critical Discourse Analysis considers discourse as a functionally grounded and a multifunctional phenomenon (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). In this

context, CDA applies functional (Halliday 1994, Van Leeuwen 2008) and critical discourse analytic approaches (Wodak & De Cillia 2009) in the linguistic methods of the analysis. The systemic-functional theory of language focuses on patterns of language that represent concerns of ideology, social system, and power. In this framework, Halliday (1994) identifies three contexts of the situation, namely field, tenor, and mode. The frameworks are realized by metafunctions that operate simultaneously. These are the following: the ideational, the interpersonal, and the textual metafunctions. Metafunctions are manifested by the lexico-grammatical system where transitivity corresponds to the ideational metafunction, mood and modality are associated with the interpersonal metafunction, and the theme-rheme framework is related to the textual metafunction. From the point of view of CDA, identity can be considered firstly as a representation in language (the ideational metafunction): transitivity and metaphor can be used to analyze its construction. Transitivity is the grammatical expression of the connections among participants and circumstances as a parallel phenomenon with the ideational metafunction. Van Leeuwen (2008) develops the transitivity framework in a model of representation of social actors that can be useful for the discourse analysis of identity. Examining the roles of agents van Leeuwen formulates a number of sociometric classes. *Activation* and *passivation* exist in the traditional active or passive voice. Linguistic forms can express the agent or the beneficiary roles such as the modal auxiliary *have to*. In *inclusion* and *exclusion*, the actor may or may not occur such as in agency deletion. Finally, the strategy of *genericization* conceives identity general rather than specific. On the contrary, *specification* attaches concrete actors to concrete situations.

Being aware of the fact that metaphor is primarily a stylistic notion, Wodak and De Cillia (2009) claim that the agency can be obscured by the use of metaphor. Thus, metaphor functions as the intermediary tool between inclusion and exclusion within the transitivity framework.

Secondly, identity appears as a *position* in the discourse (the interpersonal metafunction). The way people use pronouns, especially addressing recipients, has implications for the relationships between people and the way they are positioned in discourse. The *expressive* feature of language conveys characteristics of evaluative areas, which can be analyzed by attention to modality.

Thirdly, the textual metafunction can be explained in the framework of theme and rheme. Halliday (1994) describes the way in which the aspects of clauses are foregrounded or backgrounded. The first element of the clause is the theme while the information plays the role of a new topic on the second place. In this way, the more relevant information is foregrounded, the less salient information is backgrounded placing the actor in a prominent or a subsidiary position.

6   The acceptance speech of Senator Obama

The present analysis concerns the acceptance speech of Barack Obama at the Democratic Convention, in Denver, Colorado. The title of the speech was "The American Promise". We used CQ Transcriptions comprising 13 pages with 4,867 word counts for the analysis.

The speech shows the characteristics of the charismatic views of power in the representation of institutional identity, and the effort to construct national identity on the part of the speaker. The analysis focuses on detailing the linguistic means that create unity, sameness and solidarity within a discourse product.

6.1 Metaphor as a linguistic means to create national identity

Wodak and De Cillia (2009) claim that a metaphor used consistently through a text can achieve ideological purposes. Consequently, a speaker may use a metaphor to construct national identity by referring to the temporal features of the past (1), present (2) and future (3) (Hall 1996).

At the beginning of the speech, Senator Obama clearly defines the metaphor of the 'American promise' that has been a link between the past, present and future. The target domain of the metaphor 'American promise' alludes to three distinct source domains. First, it refers to the 'Promised Land' from the Bible in which God gave Abraham and his descendants Palestina to re-establish their national homeland. Second, the 'Land of Promise' can be associated with George Washington's expression for the United States as a promise of economic growth. Third, Martin Luther King used it as an escape from slavery in his speech "I've Been to the Mountaintop" (4).

(1)   *A young man and a young woman <u>shared</u> a belief that in America, their son <u>could achieve</u> whatever he put his mind to.* **(past)**

(2)   *It is that promise ... that through hard work and sacrifice each of us <u>can pursue</u> our individual dreams.* **(present)**

(3)   *but still come together as one American family, to ensure that the <u>next generation can pursue</u> their dreams, as well.* **(future)**

The unity of different races also plays an important role in the metaphor. Here, Obama refers to Martin Luther King, the leader of the Civil Rights Movement in the 60's.

(4)   *And it is that promise that, 45 years ago brought Americans from every corner of this land to stand together on a Mall in Washington ... and hear a young preacher from Georgia to speak of his dream.*

6.2 Pronouns

There are linguistic means other than metaphor discussed above, which are used to demonstrate the unity of the nation. Obama uses a variety of pronouns to address his audience and to express sameness and solidarity within the nation. The deictic expression *we* can be used in the service of showing solidarity with all the Democrats and the entire country. The first-person plural personal pronoun indicates inclusion and exclusion according to the intention of the speaker. Addressee-inclusive statements, being the second most frequent pronoun in the speech, speak to all Americans.

(5)   *America, <u>we are a better country</u> than these last eight years.*

Senator Obama represents the interest of the Democratic Party, which nominated him for this position. Therefore, he uses addressee-exclusive statements that target the Democrats only but exclude the members of the other party.

(6)   *<u>We are here</u> because we love this country too much to let the next four years look just like the last eight.*

The acceptance speech was about the political program of the Democratic candidate running for the presidency in 2008. Coming from this fact, Obama had to show full responsibility, determination and honesty to people. The first-person singular personal pronoun plays a decisive role in the speech. It is the most frequently used pronoun demonstrating the full commitment of a senator who runs for the presidency. The speaker's frequent use of the first-person singular personal pronoun includes American people in his future tasks. The one-man responsibility for the whole country forms an essential part of national identity.

(7)   *<u>I</u> will never hesitate to defend this nation. I will cut taxes.*

Senator Obama uses the second-person plural personal pronoun when he intends to show sympathy for people in need (8). Private addressing brings people closer to the audience creating a familiar atmosphere among people. Private addressing shows not only sympathy, but also closeness with the target group. Addressing Democrats with the second-person singular pronoun demonstrates equality and good-fellowship among the party members also emphasizing the in-group feeling (9).

(8)   *More <u>of you have lost</u> your homes,…<u>you</u> can't <u>afford</u> to drive…*

(9)   *But I stand <u>before you tonight…it's about you.</u>*

The speaker-exclusive third-person plural pronoun is used for sympathy with everyday people who are in need of jobs (10). However, the third-person plural pronoun also appears as a cohesive force that can unite Republicans and Democrats in the campaign (11). Nevertheless, the speaker-exclusive third-person plural pronoun is used for divisive function. It represents the members of the opponent party expressing emotional distance toward them (12).

(10)   *Tell that to proud auto workers at a Michigan plant who, after <u>they found</u> it was closing, kept showing up every day and working as hard as ever…*

(11)   *The men and women who serve in our battlefields may be Democrats and Republicans, but <u>they have fought together</u>…*

(12)   *<u>They claim</u> that our insistence on … is just a Trojan horse for higher taxes.*

The most frequent use of addressee-inclusive and speaker-inclusive pronouns shows that the speech oscillates between the representation of the speaker and that of the nation.

	inclusive		*exclusive*	
addressee	*'we'*	*n = 40*	*'we'*	*n = 17*
speaker	*'I'*	*n = 65*	*'you'*	*n = 27*
			'they'	*n = 9*
	'he'	*n = 2*		

Table 1: Frequency of pronouns in relation to addressee-speaker inclusive-exclusive categories

6.3 Role – Allocation

Role allocation plays a significant role in representations (Fairclough 1989). On the one hand, an agent is described as an *acto*r, on the other hand, a patient appears to be *a goal* in a given action. Van Leeuwen (2008) claims that there need not be a correspondence between the roles of social actors and the grammatical roles of them. Representation can involve social actors in either active or passive roles. Activation occurs when a social actor represents an active part in the

events; passivation occurs when a person is described as undergoing an activity. The active role is foregrounded as it appears in the examples of the speech. The speaker raises active social participants (actors) as examples demonstrating that American people are competent human beings who are capable of taking a proactive role in life.

(13)   *They work hard… and they keep going without complaint.*

Passive roles are expressed in a more transformed way in the speech. Van Leeuwen (2008) writes that the passivated actor can be subjected to beneficiary roles. In particular cases, not only passive constructions, but also modal auxiliaries can express passive recipient roles. The modal auxiliary *have to* is used to demonstrate the participant's passive position in the social situation. The modal auxiliary above indicates that the necessity does not come from inner compulsion, but it is imposed by force of circumstance. As a conclusion, the social actor is a passive sufferer of the events. In the speech, role passivation seems to be an isolated example of the speaker to represent his sympathy with the vulnerable people in society. Thus, role passivation plays no significant role in the demonstration of national identity.

(14)   *A man in Indiana <u>has to pack up</u> the equipment that he's worked for 20 years and watch as it's shipped to China.*

6.4 Genericization – Specification

Generic or specific reference is an important factor in the representations of social actors. Generic references appear as general classes; specific references can occur as particular persons in the texts. According to Bourdieu (1986), concrete references are connected to the characteristics of the working class; generalized conceptions are linked to the experiences of the dominant class. The audience determines the speaker's choice between the codes. In working class speech, ordinary people are often directed specifically and government agents generically. Specific referencing can be considered as a significant element addressing ordinary people in Obama's speech.

(15)   *I think about <u>my grandmother</u>, who worked her way up from the secretarial pool to middle management … She's the one who taught me about hard work.*

Generic references are applied to the government using a metonymy of the site of it, Washington.

(16)   *When <u>Washington</u> doesn't work, all its promises seem empty.*

6.5 Inclusion and exclusion of social actors

The acceptance speech of Senator Obama draws on the representation of the political practice of showing unity, solidarity and identity of a nation. This practice involves a broad spectrum of social actors such as auto workers or military families. The inclusion-exclusion criterion of social actors is tied closely to the propaganda strategy of the Candidate of the Democratic Party, Senator Obama. The inclusion criteria involve affiliation to the Democratic Party and sympathy for low-income-groups of society. Active verb forms (*traveled*, *made*, *meet*) indicate the active social actors in the speech. The most frequently included social actors are the Democrats, minorities, and finally the opponent candidate.

The beginning of the speech addresses the Democratic Party that nominated him for the campaign.

(17)   <u>We meet at</u> one of those defining moments, a moment when our nation is at war, our economy is in turmoil, and the American promise has been threatened once more.

Senator Obama extends his message to members or sympathizers of the Republican Party showing that his future policy would be beneficial to everyone.

(18)   The challenges we face require tough choices. And <u>Democrats, as well as Republicans,</u> will need to cast off the worn-out ideas and politics of the past.

Senator Obama does not omit the groups of different sexual orientations, who may suffer from discrimination in the society.

(19)   I know there are differences on same-sex marriage, but surely we can agree that <u>our gay and lesbian brothers and sisters</u> deserve to visit the person they love in a hospital and to live lives free of discrimination.

By the end of the speech, Senator Obama addresses all Americans without any exclusions. Therefore, he must embrace all the people without discriminating any group. He quotes Martin Luther King's famous speech of solidarity, unity, and vision.

(20)   "We cannot walk alone," the preacher cried. "And as we walk, we must make the pledge that we shall always march ahead. We cannot turn back."
<u>America, we cannot</u> turn back.

The speech is built on the inclusion of social actors. Therefore, some exclusions leave no traces in the representation. The middle class is not addressed on the part of the speaker. Some exclusions are less radical: the excluded social actors are not mentioned in a characteristic action, but they appear somewhere else in the text. In this case, these social actors are backgrounded so that the readers can feel their secondary role in the action.

In the following example, the opponent candidate's actions are foregrounded (*he propose hundreds of billions in tax breaks*) while the beneficiaries are backgrounded (*for big corporations and oil companies*). These forms play the role of the goal in the action. The latter adverbial structure demonstrates the beneficiary's backgrounded role.

(21)   *How else could he propose hundreds of billions in tax breaks <u>for big corporations and oil companies,</u> but not one penny of tax relief to more than 100 million Americans?*

6.6 Modals

The speech is characterized by expressing certainty on the part of the speaker towards the audience whom he intends to convince about the appropriateness of his political program. High modality features the speech by the application of the modal auxiliaries of *will, must, and should.* High modality is used for a recommendation on future or problem solution. W*ill* expresses the truth of what is asserted. The first-person singular personal pronoun and the modal *will* construction occur in the greatest number in the speech compared to other pronoun and modal constructions. Deontic modalities (Portner 2009) such as *will* indicate how the world ought to be according to the speaker's norms. *Will* as a dynamic-deontic modality shows the way the speaker's willingness to control the situation. Determination, desire, and certainty are decisive features of a competent leader of a nation.

(22)   *I will – listen now – <u>I will cut taxes</u> – cut taxes – for 95 percent of all working families ...*

The first-person plural personal pronoun with the modal *will* construction is an extension of Obama's intention to embrace the whole nation. The structure *we will* expresses determination and cooperation with the people of the US.

(23)   <u>*We will do*</u> *this.* <u>*We will keep*</u> *our promise to every young American.*

Must varies in meaning from the expression of obligation, of a sense of inner compulsion or of what is necessary for the speaker's opinion. In the speech, the speaker wants the potential voters feel the necessity and obligation of the future deeds by the use of this deontic modality. *Must, should,* and *have to* as deontic modalities express the directive intention of the speaker.

(24)   *So we must keep America's promise abroad.*

S*hould* is used for expressing a weaker form of obligation. This deontic modality indicates what may reasonably be expected. The speaker draws attention to the responsibility of the future government; therefore, expectancies are formulated with the help of *should.*

(25)   *Our government should work for us, not against us.*

Expressing obligation or necessity can be described by using *have to* if the duty is imposed by a person other than the speaker or force of circumstance. Senator Obama wants to emphasize that external events forced people to do what was expected of them.

(26)   *We're a better country than one where a man has to pack up the equipment that he has worked on for 20 years.*

The modal c*an* is used to indicate the possession of the ability in particular circumstances to perform the activity indicated by the main verb. In the speech, the construction *you can* expresses the speaker's intention that people can perform certain actions the Senator anticipates. The modals *can* and *cannot* belong to the volatile type of deontic modalities expressing the speaker's wishes and desires.

(27)   *so you can someday watch your child receive her college diploma.*

The use of *cannot* expresses actions that are improbable.

(28)   *We cannot meet 21st-century challenges with 20th-century bur*ea*ucracy.*

The entire speech is characterized by mainly deontic modality. The speaker expresses certainty with the modal *will*. *Must* is used for obligation towards the nation and the future president. *Can* representing ability is applied to all the people of America. Epistemic modality (Portner 2009) shows the possibility of some knowledge of the speaker. Epistemic modals, such as *could* and *would,* are

characteristic of statements addressing the speaker's opponent, Senator McCain. These statements express low probability on the part of the addressee. Low modality (*could, would*) allows for a speculative conclusion to be drawn.

(29) *Why else <u>would he define</u> middle-class as someone making $5 million a year?*

(30) *How else <u>could he propose</u> hundreds of billions in tax breaks for big corporates and oil companies, but not one penny of tax relief to more than 100 million Americans?*

Deontic and high modality	will	'I'	n = 26	'We'	n = 5
	must	'We'	n = 7	'fathers'	n = 1
	should	'Government'	n =4		
Volatile modality	can	'You'	n = 5		
	cannot/can't	'We'	n = 2	'You'	n = 1
Epistemic and low modality	would	'He'	n = 1		
	could	'He'	n = 1		

Table 2: Number of occurrences of modals connected to pronouns in high and low modality categories

7   Conclusion

The analysis of the acceptance speech of Senator Obama has evidenced the use of particular linguistic means which may create a national identity for the people of America. The speech reflects the political practice of showing unity, solidarity and identity of a nation.

First, the speaker applies the metaphor *promise* as a figurative use of language to interconnect the American people emphasizing sameness and solidarity between them. Second, a broad-spectrum of social actors is presented for the audience. Senator Obama builds the speech mainly on the inclusion of social actors he addresses in the message. They are the members and sympathizers of the Democratic Party. The speaker uses a broader category of inclusion when he speaks to those who are affected by the economic crisis. In role-allocation, the active social roles are overwhelming in the speech. The active roles are foregrounded demonstrating that people can take initiating roles in their lives. The passive beneficiary role proves that necessity is imposed on people by force

of circumstances. Third, Senator Obama applies specific referencing to bring the situations and people closer to those he wants to convince. Explicit reference is used as setting examples to ordinary people in order that they should believe in the values the speaker mentions.

The investigation has also proved that the use of pronouns expresses the speaker's intention to show sameness with the nation. Therefore, addressee-inclusive statements with the first-person plural personal pronoun are used in a significant number in the speech. Speaker-inclusive statements with the first-person singular personal pronoun are used in the greatest number demonstrating the vocation and commitment of a senator who runs for the presidency. Speaker-exclusive statements with the second person plural pronoun show sympathy and closeness with the addressed group.

The speech is characterized by high modality with the help of deontic modals such as *will, should,* and *must.* These modal auxiliaries express the determination on the part of the speaker and obligation for the nation. The use of modals expressing improbability or external commitment is scarce. Epistemic modals, such as *would* and *could,* are characteristic of the statements describing the opponent Senator.

A number of restrictions of the study should be acknowledged. First, the analysis does not extend to each framework of the metafunctions of language use, such as vocabulary, mood, presupposition and collocation as Halliday described in his work. Second, linguistic means of institutional identity expressing charismatic features need to be elaborated more precisely. Third, only one piece of discourse cannot give a profound analysis on the representation of national identity.

As a conclusion, we can claim that the acceptance speech of Senator Obama reflects the inclusion of the whole nation by role-allocation, the use of pronouns and modals. The metaphor running through the whole speech demonstrates the narration of the nation, and at the same time, refers to the cohesive force among the American people.

The findings of the analysis show that the representation of institutional-national identity involves mainly inclusive elements in Senator Obama's speech that contribute to demonstrating the unity of the nation.

Endnote

[1] CQ: Congressional Quaterly, Inc. Transcription is the source for accurate transcriptions of speeches, press conferences, and congressional hearings.

References

Agar, M. (1985) 'Institutional discourse.' *Text 5 (3)*, 147-68.

Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso.

Benwell, B. and Stokoe, E. (2006) *Discourse and Identity.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'The forms of capital.' In: Richardson, J. (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education.* New York: Greenwood. 241-258.

Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999) *Discourse and Late Modernity.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Derrida, J. (1976) *Of Grammatology.* (trans. by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, 1998) The John Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, Maryland.

Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language.* London: Longman.

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge.* London and New York: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1963) *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Grant, D. and Iedema, R. (2005) 'Discourse analysis and the study of organizations.' *An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse 25 (1)*, 37-66.

Hall, S. (1996) 'The question of cultural identity.' In: Hall, S., Held, D., Hubert, D. and Thompson, K. (eds) *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies.* London: Blackwell Publishers. 595-634.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1994) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold.

Hegel, G. W. F. [1807] (1977) *Phenomenology of Spirit.* (trans. by A. V. Miller) Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jones, S. R. and McEwen, M. K. (2007) 'A conceptual model of multiple dimensions of identity.' *Journal of College Students Development.* 405-414.

Leary, M. R. and Tangney, J. P. (2003*) Handbook of Self and Identity*. New York: Guilford Press.

Lemert, C. (2004) *Social Theory: The Multicultural and Classic Readings.* Westview Press Boulder.

Mäkitalo, A. and Saljö, R. (2000) 'Talk in institutional context and institutional context in talk: Categories as situated practices.' *Text 22 (1)*, 57-82.

Mayr, A. (2004) *Prison Discourse: Language as a Means of Control and Resistance.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Parsons, T. (1963) 'On the concept of political power.' *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society.* Vol. 107. No. 3. Reprinted in: Talcott Parsons, *Politics and Social Structure.* New York: Free Press. 1969. 232-262.

Portner, P. (2009) *Modality.* Oxford University Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1992) *Oneself as Another.* (trans. by Kathleen Blamey) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. C. (1986) 'The social identity theory of intergroup behavior.' In: Worchel, S. and Austin, W. G. (eds) *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. 7-24. Chicago IL: Nelson-Hall.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1998) *Political Discourse and Ideology.* London: Sage.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2008), *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Weinrich, P. and Saunderson, W. (2003) (eds) *Analysing Identity: Cross-Cultural, Societal and Clinical Context.* London: Routledge.

Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (2003) 'Introduction: Theory, interdisciplinarity and critical discourse analysis.' In: Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (eds) *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity.* London: Palgrave Macmillan. 1-34.

Wodak, R. and De Cillia, R. (2009) *The Discursive Construction of National Identity.* Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.

Wodak, R. and Meyer, J. (2009) *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

Internet source:

Barack Obama's Acceptance Speech www.nytimes.com/2008/08/28/us/politics/28text-obama.html?

Monika Gyuró is Assistant Professor of English Language and Health Communication at the Faculty of Health Sciences, Pécs University, Pécs, Hungary. Her research fields involve discourse analysis, pragmatics and argumentation theory, focusing on medical, legal, and political discourses. She has been participating in the work of the Pécs School of Argumentation since 2003. This inter-university research cooperation funded by the National Science Foundation and the Hungarian Academy of Sciences is linguistically oriented. She investigated discourse coherence and arguments in health-related interviews, in which argumentation theory is applied to the clinical interview.

Address: Monika Gyuró PhD., Institute for Health Insurance, Faculty of Health Sciences, Pécs University, Mária u. 5-7., 7621-Pécs, Hungary. [e-mail: gyuro@etk.pte.hu]